

REMARKS**SUMMARY**

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-33 remain in the application. Claims 1-33 are subject to examination.
Claims 6, 9, and 10 have been amended.

Applicant appreciatively acknowledges the Examiner's consideration and acceptance of the drawings filed on December 20, 2004.

SPECIFICATION/CLAIM OBJECTIONS

In "Specification Objections" in the third paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified final Office Action, the final Office Action objected to the specification because it allegedly fails to provide proper antecedent basis for "third control section" and "third content section" in the claimed subject matter. The applicant respectfully traverses. On Page 8, lines 8 and 9, the specification provides that "each subordinate web page specifications 204/206 includes *at least* <head> Section 222/232 and <body> section 224/234." Moreover, the specification further states on page 8, lines 9-12, that three exemplary control sections may include content placement, style and navigation. Thus, the present invention is not limited to two controls sections.

In "Claim Objections" in the fourth paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified final Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6 and 9 because of informalities. The Examiner's suggested corrections to claim 6 and 9 have been made. Moreover, claims 9 and 10 have been amended to clarify and identify the elements consistently.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" the third paragraph on page 3 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 1-23, 26-29 and 32-33 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,860,073, *Ferrel, et al* (hereinafter "**FERREL**") under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed would be helpful. Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*, a method for using a "**master specification specifying a common style, a common navigation arrangement and common content placement** for each resultant web page to be generated." The remaining claims 2 through 33 are each premises upon the use of a master specification to control the common design of a number of web pages to be generated. The common design includes content placement, and at least one of style and navigation. Each web page references the single master specification for layout and style and/or navigation.

The FERREL reference discloses a method for using style sheets to format content in an online publishing system (See *e.g.*, FERREL Col. 1, Lines 5-7). In particular, FERREL teaches the division of each webpage into independent display regions or "controls" (See *e.g.*, FERREL Col. 3, Line 14), the linking of each display control to a style sheet (See *e.g.*, FERREL Fig. 13a and b, and Col. 3, Line 12-14), and the linking of each content object to a display control. (See *e.g.*, FERREL Fig. 8).

In the present invention, spatial placement of the substantive content on each page is determined by the single master specification. Claim 1 teaches "defining a master specification specifying ... common content placement for each resultant web page" and "generating said first and second resultant web pages ... in accordance with said common content placement." In contrast, while FERREL does teach a method of content placement, it does not teach the method of common content placement among pages, as recited in the instant application. As Figure 8 of FERREL shows, the layout for page must be independently created, requiring the size of each control to be separately selected and edited by the designer (See *e.g.*, FERREL Col. 19, Lines 24-25). In the present invention, layout for each page need not be separately created or edited. By having a "master specification"

control placement of substantive content, as recited in Claim 1 of the instant application, no modifications to the web page specifications are necessary when the common area changes in size and/or shape.

Further, FERREL fails to show any method of navigation between the pages and, thus, does not disclose a method for applying common navigation between the pages. In the instant application, common navigation is accomplished by "a master specification ... specifying common navigation arrangement," as shown in Claim 1.

In the present invention, Claim 1 teaches "master specification specifying common style." FERREL teaches away from one common source for style elements, with each object having its own style specifications. In FERREL, each display or content object must be linked to a display control, which may have variable formatting elements. "Each static story control or picture control is linked at publication time to just one object. Each of the controls on the page 434 references a style sheet 443 to provide formatting instructions on how the content is to be displayed" (See FERREL Col. 19, Lines 7-11). "On each page are controls which contain instructions for gathering, formatting and displaying the linked content onto the page" (See FERREL Col. 6, Lines 64-66). Each display control must be linked to a style sheet, with variable formatting elements. "Content objects are viewed after being formatted by a particular linked control. The control knows how to format a particular piece of content by looking at the style that has been defined for that content by the designer and then comparing that style to a linked style sheet. Because each control on a page can have a different associated style sheet, different controls on the same page can each display the same linked content in varying formats." Thus, in contrast to the present invention, FERREL does not teach common design by way of a master specification for all content, but rather FERREL requires multiple steps for each content object. (See FERREL Col. 7, Lines 6-12).

In FERREL, the content on a particular resultant web page has no common design, as the design of each element is independently determined, nor is there a common design among web pages. The creation of each page design requires multiple steps and multiple links. Figure 8 of FERREL demonstrates three resultant web pages, each with a unique layout that the designer must separately create. Each content object has its own formatting

elements, which the designer must separately create. Each content object has its own formatting elements, which the designer must separately create and apply to the object by separately linking to the control and to a style sheet. Changes in layout must be applied to each page; changes in style and formatting must be applied to each style sheet or control or the links between individual content objects, controls and style sheets must be changed. FERREL does not teach the use of one master specification controlling common design.

The instant application teaches the use of a single master specification to create common design in layout and or style or navigation, which applies to all web pages and all content contained in those web pages, and which is referenced a single instance by the resultant web page. Claim 1 shows "first and second resultant web pages ... with said common content placement and said common style specified by said master specification, and set first and second resultant web pages having said common navigation arrangement specified by said master specification."

In view of the foregoing, the Examiner is requested to withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in paragraph three "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102" on page 3 of the above-identified office action and issue a Notice of Allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" the fifth paragraph on page 29 of the above-identified final Office Action, claims 25 and 31 have been rejected as being obvious over FERREL, in view of *Keating*, U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2002/0052895 (hereinafter "KEATING").

Claims 24 and 30 have been rejected as being obvious over FERREL, in view of *Lie, et al.*, "Cascading Style Sheets, Level 1" W3C Recommendation 17 Dec 1996, revised 11 Jan 1999 (hereinafter "LIE") and KEATING.

In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections. It is believed that the claims were patentable for at least the reasons presented and discussed above over the cited references in their original form and, therefore, the claims have not been amended to overcome the references.

Application No. 09/816,552
Confirmation No. 6531

- 19 -

Attorney Docket No. 109870-130113
IPG No. P103

SEA/109870/130113/KHF/337652.3

KEATING does not remedy the deficiencies previously discussed in FERREL, namely the proposed combination of references do not teach the use of a master specification to control the common design, including content placement, and at least one of style and navigation, of a number of web pages to be generated as recited in the claims of the instant application.

Additionally, LIE, alone or in combination with KEATING, does not remedy the deficiencies previously discussed in FERREL, namely the proposed combination of references do not teach the use of a master specification to control the common design, including content placement, and at least one of style and navigation, of a number of web pages to be generated as recited in the claims of the instant application.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1, 6, 16, 19, 22, or 28. Claim 1, 6, 16, 19, 22, and 28 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 1, 6, 16, 19, 22, or 28.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-33 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the remaining claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out. In the alternative, the entry of the amendment is requested, as it is believed to place the application in better condition for appeal, without requiring extension of the field of search.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-33 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicant submits that claims 1-33 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (206) 407-1509. If any fees are due in connection

Application No. 09/816,552
Confirmation No. 6531

- 20 -

Attorney Docket No. 109870-130113
IPG No. P103

SEA/109870/130113/KHF/337652.3

with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Date: July 20, 2005

by:

Kyle H. Flindt
Kyle H. Flindt
Reg No.: 42,539

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97222
Telephone: 503-222-9981